

REMARKS

Prior to entry of this paper, Claims 1-20 were pending. Claims 1-20 were rejected. In this paper, Claims 1 and 7 are amended; no claims are cancelled or added. Claims 1-20 are currently pending. No new matter is added by way of this amendment. For at least the following reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that each of the presently pending claims is in condition for allowance.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102 & §103

Claims 1, 4, 7, 10, 13, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (e) as being anticipated by Ruberg (US 6,895,588). Claims 2-3, 5-6, 8-9, 11-12, 14-18, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Ruberg (US 6,895,588) in view of Elteto (US 2001/0043702). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Claim 1 teaches a method for detecting the attachment of a shared resource to a server, querying if the shared resource is associated with a share indicator stored at the server, and if the share indicator is present, applying a share allocation associated with the share indicator to the shared resource.

The claimed share indicator allows the server to determine whether the shared resource has been previously detected by the server. Ruberg fails to specifically disclose Applicants' claimed share indicator that is stored at the server, or *any* similar mechanism for maintaining information about a share allocation at the server following the detachment of the shared resource from the server. In contrast, Ruberg merely notes that the device manager "should be aware that devices could be connected, disconnected, or moved while the desktop unit is functioning and while being controlled by a service" (column 5, lines 29 - 32 of Ruberg). Ruberg further discloses that a connection to a device may be established using "*standard* session management services" (emphasis added; see, e.g., column 5, lines 65 - 67 of Ruberg). As a result, since Ruberg merely discloses standard systems, Ruberg must be presumed to comply with prior art systems (for example, as

described at pages 1, 2, paragraph [0002], lines 8 - 16 of Applicants' specification) that require shares to be reallocated by an administrator or administrative function upon reconnecting a recognized shared device to a server unit. Requiring an administrator or administrative function is not automatic. Further, a review of Ruberg, column 5, lines 16-40 does not appear anywhere to reveal a share indicator at the server that is associated with the shared resource. Therefore, since Ruberg does not disclose *automatically* using a *share indicator*, as claimed, in part, by at least Claim 1, Ruberg cannot anticipate nor render obvious at least Claim 1. Applicants respectfully request the rejection be withdrawn.

Furthermore, since independent Claim 7 is substantially similar, albeit different, to Claim 1, Claim 7 is novel and non-obvious for at least the same reasons as Claim 1.

Independent Claim 13 claims at least *two* storage tables: a system for storing a descriptor table with an entry identifying share allocation for a known storage free device, and storing a shared resource table to identify a share allocation of shared devices, wherein a share file is automatically created in the shared resource table for an unknown device which enables identification and automatic allocation of sharing for the unknown device. (see, e.g., page 3, line 11 - page 4, line 6 of Applicants' specification).

In contrast to Claim 13, as discussed above, Ruberg's device manager requires shared resources to be reallocated by an administrator or administrative function upon reconnecting a recognized shared device to a server unit. No mention is made of the novel use of *two separate tables* to enable identification and automatic allocation for sharing of an unknown device. Thus, since Ruberg fails to suggest or teach at least one novel and non-obvious aspect of Claim 13, this claim is allowable. Furthermore, since independent Claim 19 is substantially similar to Claim 13 in some ways, albeit different in other ways, Claim 19 is novel and non-obvious for at least the same reasons as Claim 13.

In summary, Applicants respectfully submit that none of independent Claims 1, 7, 13 and 19 are anticipated or made obvious by Ruberg, and that these claims are therefore each in condition for

allowance. As each of Claims 2 - 6, 8 - 12, 14 - 18 and 20 depends from one of allowable independent Claims 1, 7, 13 or 19, their respective dependent claims 2 - 6, 8 - 12, 14 - 18 and 20 are also novel and non-obvious in view of Ruberg and the suggested combination of Ruberg with Elteto.

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that each of the presently pending claims (Claims 1-20) is in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is requested. Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' representative at the below-listed telephone number if it is believed that the prosecution of this application may be assisted thereby. Although only certain arguments regarding patentability are set forth herein, there may be other arguments and reasons why the claimed invention is patentable. Applicant reserves the right to raise these arguments in the future.

Dated: March 13, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By 

John W. Branch

Registration No.: 41,633

DARBY & DARBY P.C.

P.O. Box 5257

New York, New York 10150-5257

(206) 262-8906

(212) 527-7701 (Fax)

Attorneys/Agents For Applicant